



#22

PATENT APPLICATION
Docket No. 4164-158

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE **RECEIVED**

In re application of: John F. Acres Conf. No. 8782 JUL 27 2004
Serial No.: 09/694,065 Group No.: 3714 **OFFICE OF PETITIONS**
Filed: October 19, 2000 Examiner: Corbett B. Coburn
For: A METHOD OF IMPLEMENTING CASHLESS PLAY OF
 GAMING DEVICES INTERCONNECTED BY A COMPUTER
 NETWORK

Mail Stop Petition
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**SUPPLEMENTAL APPEAL BRIEF
UNDER 37 CFR §1.192 and §1.193(b)(2)(ii)**

This Supplemental Appeal Brief is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed September 29, 2003, finally rejecting claims 1-35 and 37-61 in this application. For the convenience of the Examiner and the Board, the Appellant has identified all previously-raised issues and/or arguments herein without reference to the previously filed briefs.

This Supplemental Appeal Brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal mailed in this case on October 28, 2002.

This Brief is transmitted in triplicate.

This Brief contains these items under the following headings, and in the order set forth below.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST
- II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
- III. STATUS OF CLAIMS
- IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS
- V. SUMMARY OF INVENTION
- VI. ISSUES
- VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS
- VIII. ARGUMENT
- IX. APPENDIX

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST 37 CFR §1.192(c) (1)

Acres Gaming, Inc. is the real party in interest.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES 37 CFR §1.192(c) (2)

None.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS 37 CFR §1.192(c) (3)

Status of All the Claims:

- 1. Claims presented: 1-61
- 2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not cancelled: NONE
- 3. Claims canceled: 36
- 4. Claims pending: 1-35 and 37-61

of which:

- a. Claims allowed: NONE
- b. Claims rejected: 1-35 and 37-61

All the rejected claims, namely claims 1-35 and 37-61, are being appealed. The appealed claims are eligible for appeal, having been finally rejected.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS **37 CFR §1.192(c) (4)**

There have been no amendments.

V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION **37 CFR §1.192(c) (5)**

The present invention comprises a method for implementing cashless play of gaming devices interconnected by a computer network. Gaming devices are interconnected by a network to a host computer. Specification, page 2, line 1. A player account accessible by a host computer is created. Specification, page 2, lines 1-2. Access to the account is provided responsive to a first command initiated by a player at one of the gaming devices. Specification, page 2, lines 2-3. Credit is then transferred from the account to the gaming device, which the player then plays. Specification, page 2, lines 3-4. After play, the player cashes out from the gaming device using a second command at the gaming device. Specification, page 2, lines 4-5.

VI. ISSUES ON APPEAL **37 CFR §1.192(c) (6)**

- A. The Examiner rejected claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter not described in the specification in a way to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

- B. The Examiner rejected claims 33, 36,¹ 40, and 43-49 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,470,079 to LeStrange et al. (“LeStrange”) under 35 U.S.C §102(b).
- C. The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 12 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,967,896 to Jorasch et al. (“Jorasch”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,880,237 to Kishishita (“Kishishita”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).
- D. The Examiner rejected claims 11 & 13-15 as obvious over Jorasch and Kishishita and in view of LeStrange under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).
- E. The Examiner rejected claim 16 as obvious over Jorasch, Kishishita and LeStrange as applied to claim 13 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,227,972 to Walker et al. (“Walker”) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).
- F. The Examiner rejected claims 17-30, 32, and 55-61 as obvious over Jorasch in view of LeStrange under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).
- G. Claim 31 is rejected as obvious over Jorasch and LeStrange as applied to claim 17, in view of Walker under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).
- H. Claims 34, 35 and 37 are rejected as obvious over LeStrange as discussed in connection with claims 33 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).
- I. Claims 38, 39, 41 and 42 are rejected as obvious over LeStrange as applied to claim 33 in view of Jorasch under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).
- J. Claim 50 is rejected as obvious over LeStrange as applied to claim 33 in view of Walker under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).
- K. Claim 51 is rejected as obvious over Jorasch and Kishishita as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Walker under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

¹ Claim 36 has been canceled.

L. Claims 52-54 are rejected as obvious over Jorasch and LeStrange as applied to claim 17, 20, or 38 above, and further in view of Kishishita under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS
37 CFR §1.192(c) (7)

Group I contains claim 59. As there is only one claim in the group, the claim stands alone and is independently patentable.

Group II contains claims 33, 36², 40 and 43-49. The claims of the group do not stand or fall together. Each claim and each embodiment thereof is independently patentable.

Group III contains claims 1-10 and 12. The claims of the group do not stand or fall together. Each claim and each embodiment thereof is independently patentable.

Group IV contains claims 11 and 13-15. The claims of the group do not stand or fall together. Each claim and each embodiment thereof is independently patentable.

Group V contains claim 16. As there is only one claim in the group, the claim stands alone and is independently patentable.

Group VI contains claims 17-30, 32, 55-61. The claims of the group do not stand or fall together. Each claim and each embodiment thereof is independently patentable.

Group VII contains claim 31. As there is only one claim in the group, the claim stands alone and is independently patentable.

Group VIII contains claims 34, 35, and 37. The claims of the group do not stand or fall together. Each claim and each embodiment thereof is independently patentable.

² Claim 36 has been canceled. As such, Appellant is not arguing the patentability of claim 36.

Group IX contains claims 38, 39, 41, and 42. The claims of the group do not stand or fall together. Each claim and each embodiment thereof is independently patentable.

Group X contains claim 50. As there is only one claim in the group, the claim stands alone and is independently patentable.

Group XI contains claim 51. As there is only one claim in the group, the claim stands alone and is independently patentable.

Group XII contains claims 52-54. The claims of the group do not stand or fall together. Each claim and each embodiment thereof is independently patentable.

VIII. ARGUMENT

37 CFR §1.192(c) (8)

The Examiner initially rejected Appellant's claims 1-8, 12, 18-21, and 23 as anticipated by Jorasch; claims 33, 40, and 43-49 as anticipated by LeStrange; claims 9-10 as obvious over Jorasch; claims 11, 13-15, 17, 22, 24-30, and 32 as obvious over Jorasch in view of LeStrange; claim 16 as obvious over Jorasch in view of Walker; claim 31 as obvious over Jorasch and LeStrange in view of Walker; claims 34, 35, and 37 as obvious over LeStrange; claims 38, 39, 41, and 42 as obvious over LeStrange in view of Jorasch; and claim 31 as obvious over LeStrange in view of Walker. Appellant responded by amending claims, adding new claims and making arguments to overcome the rejections. The Examiner then issued the final rejection. After reviewing Appellant's Amended Appeal Brief the Examiner reopened prosecution to reject claim 56, which had been inadvertently omitted. Appellant then requested reinstatement of the appeal and filed a Supplemental Appeal Brief.

Issue A (Group I): Claim 59 is described in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make the invention.

Claim 59 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make or use the invention. In rejecting a claim based upon 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, the Examiner has the burden to establish a “reasonable basis to question the enablement provided for the claimed invention.” MPEP §2164.04, *citing In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The Examiner must do more than state that a claim is not enabled, it is “incumbent on the Patent Office, whenever a rejection on this basis is made, to explain *why* it doubts the truth or accuracy of any statement in a supporting disclosure and to back up assertions of its own with acceptable evidence or reasoning which is inconsistent with the contested statement.” *In re Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220, 224, 169 USPQ 367, 370 (CCPA 1971), cited in MPEP §2164.04.

According to the Examiner, claim 59, “wherein the amount of said predetermined credit is not a function of the balance in the player account” is not enabled because if the predetermined amount were set at \$50, but the player account had only \$10, there is no suggestion that the transfer would be made. *See* September 29, 2003 Office Action (“Office Action”), page 2.³ The Examiner stated that this makes the transferred amount a function of the balance.

Appellant’s disclosure includes the following, beginning at page 10, line 26 and continuing to page 11, line 2:

After the player record is stored at MCI 50, the player uses keypad 80 to select cashless play. An algorithm that is part of the software stored in read only memory (ROM) (not shown) in MCI 50 then calculates an amount to transfer from the account in MCI 50 to credit meter 70 on EGM 12. **The amount transferred is a predetermined amount calculated by the algorithm; it is not selected by the player** using keypad 80. The algorithm checks flags

³ Appellant refers to the September 29, 2003 Office Action because it is the most recent Office Action and embraces all of the claims, including claim 56. However, the same arguments, except for that of claim 56, were presented in the June 27, 2002 Office Action. Appellant filed a response after final rejection of the June 27, 2002 Office Action, to which the Examiner issued an Advisory Action on October 11, 2002. Thus, the Advisory Action referred to herein was issued prior to the Office Action quoted throughout.

associated with the account for minimum and maximum transfer limits that are imposed at one of terminals 90, 92 when the account is opened. **These minimums and maximums are set regardless of the account balance.** The algorithm, of course, also examines the account balance and does not permit a transfer in excess of the account balance.

[Emphasis added]. This section provides support for the claim that the predetermined credit is not a function of the balance in the player account. The Examiner's analogy addresses whether or not a transfer occurs, not how the amount of the transfer is determined. As such, the Examiner's rejection fails to address what is recited in claim 59. Claim 59 is supported by the specification and is enabled under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Issue B (Group II): Claims 33, 40, & 43-49 are not anticipated by LeStrange because LeStrange fails to disclose each and every element of Appellant's invention.

It is well settled that a rejection based on anticipation requires the disclosure, in a single reference, of every element the Appellant claims as his invention. *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1462 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int'f 1990). In making such a rejection, it is the examiner's burden to identify where each element of the Appellant's invention is disclosed in the prior art. *See id.* The Examiner has failed to meet this burden with respect to Appellant's invention in claims 33, 40, and 43-49.

Claims 33, 40 & 43-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by LeStrange, et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,470,079) ("LeStrange"). Claim 36 has been previously cancelled.

Claim 33

As to claim 33, the Examiner stated that LeStrange discloses a method of operating gaming devices interconnected by a network to a host computer, including a player account accessible by the host computer responsive to a player initiated command. *See Office Action*, page 4. The Examiner failed to address the limitation in claim 33 of "providing access to the

account responsive to a command initiated by a player **at one of the gaming devices.**”

[Emphasis added]. LeStrange does not disclose this feature.

In the October 11, 2002, Advisory Action (“Advisory Action”), the Examiner asserted that Figures 4(a)-(b) and 5(a)-(b) of LeStrange show access to the account responsive to commands issued by the player at one of the gaming devices. However, figures 4 and 5 are flow charts illustrating the operation of the accounting system, rather than the player account as suggested by the Examiner. *See* LeStrange, column 8, lines 20-21, and column 10, lines 33-34. Moreover, steps 214-218 in LeStrange show changes to the game credit meter rather than access to the player’s account. Therefore, LeStrange fails to disclose access to the account responsive to commands issued by the player at one of the gaming devices.

The Examiner also argued that a first and second meter reading in association with transferring credit between the account and the gaming device is disclosed by LeStrange because LeStrange discloses maintaining an audit trail. *See* Office Action, page 4. Assuming *arguendo* that an audit trail were disclosed, there is nothing to suggest that such an audit trail need be comprised of a first and second meter reading in association with transferring credit between the account and the gaming device responsive to a command initiated by a player at one of the gaming devices. Indeed, the section quoted by the Examiner demonstrates that LeStrange teaches away from Appellant’s invention.

Specifically, at column 7, lines 2-4, LeStrange says that whenever the system updates meter values, the event that caused the changes is also recorded. The type of event that causes the meter value to be updated is described in LeStrange, column 6, lines 60-66:

Possible events include: coin or other money input by the player, wagers placed by the player, game wins issued to the player, a “collect” event issued by the player signifying the player’s desire to withdraw available game credit from the machine and a game change event signifying that a player has requested a change of game at a video lottery machine.

Nowhere does LeStrange refer to reading a meter a first time and reading the meter a second time. In sharp contrast, the stated events in LeStrange are all actions undertaken by the player, and not actions undertaken by the system, such as the meter readings, to ensure the integrity of the system. In the Advisory Action the Examiner stated that audit trail information is recorded whenever the system updates meter values. The portion quoted above makes explicit that meter values are updated based on actions undertaken by the player. The Examiner has not identified any portion of LeStrange that suggests that actions, other than those by a player, will trigger meter value updates. As such, LeStrange teaches away from Appellant's invention.

Claim 40

Claim 40 is not anticipated by LeStrange because LeStrange fails to disclose each element of the claim. Claim 40 claims providing access to the account responsive to a command initiated by a player at one of the gaming devices, where the command is insertion of a player tracking card into a card reader associated with the gaming device. *See* claims 33 and 40. In rejecting claim 40, the Examiner stated that column 10, line 38 of LeStrange "discloses that the command comprises insertion of the player tracking card associated with the gaming device." *See* Office Action, page 4. There is no suggestion in the cited portion that insertion of the card is the type of command recited in claim 33 or that insertion of the card provides access to the account. Rather, the cited portion says that the accounting system determines whether game credit has been purchased by the player by insertion of a valid card. Claim 40 is additionally allowable as depending from an allowable claim.

Claim 43

Claim 43 is likewise not anticipated by LeStrange because LeStrange fails to disclose each element of the claim. Claim 43 recites calculating the difference in the meter readings and comparing the calculated difference with the amount transferred. LeStrange, Figure 6

(404), cited by the Examiner in support of the rejection, only discloses computing a change in meter data by subtracting the previous reading from the current meter in response to the player's bet. *See* Office Action, page 4. Figure 6 at most calculates a difference. There is no comparison of the calculated difference to the amount transferred as Appellant claims.

Claim 44

Claim 44, which depends from claim 43, recites deducting the calculated difference from the account balance. The Examiner, without support, stated that in any accounting system the calculated difference between the initial meter reading and the post-transfer reading is equal to the amount transferred and that this amount is then deducted from the player's account balance. *See* Office Action, page 5. Not only is the statement without support, but it overlooks a unique feature of Appellant's invention. Ideally the calculated difference between the initial meter reading and the post-transfer reading will be equal to the amount of the transfer request. Assuming that the two amounts are not identical, the amount actually transferred, as opposed to the amount requested, will be deducted from the player account. Such a failsafe is not standard and is not disclosed in LeStrange.

Claim 45

Claim 45 recites storing the amount transferred and the calculated difference at a location on the network remote from the player account. The applied art does not disclose this feature. The Examiner stated that LeStrange stores accounting and customer data in one database and data reflecting changes in the credit meters in another database. *See* Office Action, page 5. But the statement is not supported by LeStrange's disclosure. LeStrange says that accounting data, including meter values, are sent to the host computer. *See* LeStrange, column 7, lines 4-6. According to LeStrange, the host computer "archives accounting data and customer data in a **database**." [Emphasis added]. *See* LeStrange, column 5, lines 33-35. Therefore, accounting data (including meter data) and customer data

(player data) are stored in the same place, the host computer, in the same database. In no way does LeStrange disclose the features of claim 45.

Claim 46

The Examiner, in claim 46, cited LeStrange at column 10, line 38, as disclosing the transfer of credit between the account and the gaming device responsive to a player-initiated command. *See* Office Action, page 5. However, line 38 discloses checking to make sure game credit has been purchased, rather than transferring credit between the account and the gaming device responsive to a player-initiated command at the gaming device. Again, LeStrange fails to disclose transferring credit between the account and the gaming device responsive to a player-initiated command, and as such claim 46 is patentable over the applied art.

Claim 47

As to claim 47, the Examiner asserted that LeStrange discloses transferring a predetermined amount to comply with state law specifying the amount that can be used in gambling. *See* Office Action, page 5. LeStrange actually discloses a different feature, namely that tickets or cards can be issued by casinos as a means for limiting the amount a player can gamble in states where the maximum amount is specified by law. *See* LeStrange, column 8, lines 10-13. Appellant claims that the amount transferred is predetermined—a different concept than LeStrange’s amount limiting technique. There is no suggestion that Appellant’s predetermined amount is a maximum amount a player can gamble. Thus, LeStrange does not disclose this feature.

Claim 48

In rejecting dependent claim 48, the Examiner stated, without support, that the amount transferred would inherently be a function of the player’s account balance because a player could not transfer more than the balance of the account to the gaming device. *See*

Office Action, page 5. This is an overbroad statement by the Examiner and fails to consider enticements offered by the casino and malfunction of the gaming machine. Thus, rather than being inherent, claim 48 recites an advantage of the invention.

Claim 49

In rejecting claim 49, the Examiner averred that LeStrange discloses classifying players and providing incentives to gamble at a particular casino. *See* Office Action, page 5. The cited portion however addresses classifying payment types rather than players. As a result, LeStrange does not disclose the feature.

LeStrange fails to disclose many significant features of Appellant's invention. As such, LeStrange does not anticipate Appellant's claims and cannot be used to reject the claims. The Examiner has failed to meet the burden established for rejecting claims under 102(b).

Issue C (Group III): Claims 1-10 & 12 are patentable over Jorasch in view of Kishishita because neither of these references alone or in combination yields Appellant's invention.

A proper obviousness rejection must be based on basic tenets of patent law. According to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP") these tenets are: 1) the invention must be considered as a whole; 2) the references must be considered as a whole and must suggest the desirability and obviousness of the combination; 3) the references must be viewed without hindsight; and 4) there must be a reasonable expectation of success. MPEP §2141. The incentive to combine references must also be readily apparent. If the incentive to combine is not readily apparent, the Examiner must explain why the combination of teachings is proper. *See Ex parte Skinner*, 2 USPQ2d 1788, 1790 (B. App. & Int'l 1986). The Examiner has failed to meet this burden.

Claims 1-10 & 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorasch, et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,967,896) (“Jorasch”) in view of Kishishita (U.S. Patent No. 4,880,237) (“Kishishita”).

Claim 1

As to claim 1, the Examiner said that Jorasch discloses gaming machines interconnected by a network to a host computer, a player account accessible by the host computer, accessing the account responsive to a first command issued by the player, transferring credits from the account to the gaming device, and cashing out the player responsive to a second player command at the gaming device. *See* Office Action, page 6. According to the Examiner, although Jorasch does not teach anonymous accounts, Kishishita does.

The Examiner cited Kishishita, column 3, lines 54-64, in support of his position that Kishishita teaches an anonymous account in which the player pays in cash and receives a bar code identifying the account. *See* Office Action, page 6. In Kishishita, the player goes to a game data processing unit generally provided at a reception desk. The game center accepts money and “**writes as data ID specific to the person** data which indicates a code number A and the number B of games which can be played with the amount of money paid. . .” [Emphasis added]. Kishishita, column 3, lines 58-61. Thus, the player goes to the reception desk and receives identification specific to that player. The identification includes a code number for tracking the player. This is not an anonymous account because the casino knows who the player is and can track his activity. As a result, the combined references fail to disclose anonymous accounts, which may be preferable to players who do not want their identities to be known to the casino but nevertheless wish to benefit from the advantages of enrollment in tracking programs.

For obviousness to exist, “either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). Cited by MPEP 2142. The combination of references does not expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention.

It was apparently not obvious to developers of the Jorasch system to include Kishishita’s player accounts because they did not do so. Jorasch was filed nine years after Kishishita issued. Were the combination so obvious and desirable, Jorasch would have used Kishishita’s accounts.

Claim 2

Claim 2 further describes creating an anonymous player account accessible by the host computer. Because the cited references do not disclose anonymous player accounts, they necessarily do not disclose the manner in which those accounts are created. The advantages to the player for such accounts has previously been discussed.

Claim 3

As to claim 3, the Examiner cited Jorasch as creating player accounts at a terminal. *See* Office Action, page 7. However, there is no suggestion that such a terminal is an automated card dispenser. The Examiner also stated that Kishishita shows creating a player account at an automated card dispenser. *See id.* But, as previously discussed, Kishishita provides a game data processing unit, generally provided at a reception desk, and not an automated card dispenser. Automated card dispensers provide additional privacy for players not wanting the casino to know their identity. Because Kishishita does not describe creating player accounts at an automated card dispenser, the combination of Jorasch and Kishishita does not describe the features of claim 3.

Claim 4

Although the Examiner cited Jorasch, at column 1, line 19, as disclosing inserting a card into a card reader associated with a gaming device, there is no suggestion in Jorasch that it is inserting the card into the card reader that provides access to the account. As such, Jorasch and Kishishita together fail to describe the features suggested by the Examiner and therefore fail to render obvious claim 4.

Claims 5

The Examiner argued the rejection of claims 5 and 6 together, and as a result the arguments for patentability for the two claims are the same.⁴ The Examiner stated that Jorasch discloses actuation of a cash-out actuator associated with the gaming device. The portion cited by the Examiner discloses that dispensing typically includes activating a hopper to dispense money to the player and that some devices alternately credit an account **based on the selected balance(s)**. *See* Jorasch, column 10, lines 6-8. There is no suggestion in claim 5 that a player must select a balance prior to cashing out of a gaming device. As such, Jorasch fails to describe the features claimed in claim 5.

Claim 6

Likewise, as to claim 6, the portion of Jorasch cited by the Examiner discloses that dispensing typically includes activating a hopper to dispense money to the player and that some devices alternately credit an account **based on the selected balance(s)**. *See* Jorasch, column 10, lines 6-8. There is no suggestion in claim 6 that a player must select a balance prior to cashing out of a gaming device. As such, Jorasch fails to describe the features claimed in claim 6.

Claim 7

⁴ Additionally, the two claims are substantially identical, although claim 5 has an intervening dependent claim, and the reasons argued for patentability for one support the other.

With respect to claim 7, the Examiner stated that Jorasch teaches local memory associated with the gaming device. *See* Office Action, page 7. It does not. The local memory (304) the Examiner refers to is located in a data storage device remote from the gaming machines. *See* Jorasch Figures 2 and 3. Appellant claims local memory associated with the gaming device. Local memory is supported in Figure 2 (50) and the supporting text of Appellant's specification.

Claim 8

As to claim 8, because the applied art fails to disclose local memory, see above with respect to claim 7, it necessarily fails to disclose transferring data from the player account in the local memory to the credit meter. The portion cited by the Examiner with respect to claim 8 again fails to disclose local memory. *See* Jorasch, column 4, lines 33-40.

Claim 9

With respect to claim 9, the Examiner stated that Jorasch and Kishishita teach the invention substantially as claimed. *See* Office Action, page 7. However, while stating that both references teach the importance of accurate accounting, the Examiner admitted that the applied references do not teach the details of accounting for the balance transferred. The Examiner cited Kishishita, column 4, lines 55-62, as supporting this position. *See* Office Action, pages 7-8.

The *audit trail* in Kishishita keeps track of the game media (coins, balls, etc.) put in the games, the number of game media expelled at wins, and the ratio between the values. Kishishita, column 4, lines 55-62. In essence, Kishishita is tracking the ratio of games to wins. There is no suggestion that this tracking is related to a player or a player balance. Rather the tracking relates to a particular machine and whether the machine has any game media left.

Jorasch likewise fails to disclose Appellant's claim 9. The Examiner has not directed Appellant to any portion of Jorasch to support his assertion that together Jorasch and Kishishita teach the invention as claimed. Indeed Jorasch does not discuss how the system involved keeps the several balances or accounts separate or ensures that accurate transfers between balances are made. Moreover, because Jorasch is an invention directed to controlling a gaming device with a plurality of balances, even if it were enabling on audit tracking, which it is clearly not, Jorasch would operate much differently than Appellant's claim 9.

Jorasch would have to reconcile pre and post-transfer meter readings among a plurality of balances and would have to ensure that the correct balance was adjusted by the correct transfer amount. As such, Jorasch would not be able to perform this function as does Appellant. Although careful accounting may be known in the art, Appellant's method of performing careful accounting is not.

Claim 10

As with claim 9, the Examiner in claim 10 acknowledged that Jorasch and Kishishita do not go into the details of the accounting procedures. The Examiner stated "[u]nless there is a problem, the calculated difference between the initial meter reading and the post-transfer reading is equal to the amount transferred." *See* Office Action, page 6. In making this statement the Examiner is highlighting one of the advantages of the claim and the problem in the prior art it addresses—that occasionally there are problems and those problems work to the detriment of the casino or gaming facility.

Rather than being an obvious accounting practice, the feature is an advantage over the prior art. The obvious accounting practice would be to deduct \$10 from the player's balance if the player requested a \$10 transfer or placed a \$10 bet. In claim 9 the device receives a request to transfer credit, reads the credit meter on the gaming device before transferring the

credit, credits the meter with the requested credit transfer, reads the credit meter on the device after crediting the meter, calculates the difference in the meter readings, compares the calculated difference with the amount credited and permits gaming device play. Only after these operations have been completed is the calculated difference deducted from the account balance.

Claim 12

The Examiner, in rejecting dependent claim 12, asserted that the transfer of credit from the account to the gaming meter occurs responsive to a first command issued by the player. *See* Office Action, page 9. Again, the Examiner omitted the key phrase *at said one gaming device*. The applied art does not, either separately or in combination, teach a request to transfer credit from the account to the gaming device responsive to a player-initiated command at said one gaming device. Such a feature is advantageous to a player not wishing to leave the machine to make a transfer or having to wait for casino personnel to make the transfer for the player.

With respect to the combination of Jorasch and Kishishita, Appellant submits that neither of these references teaches separately the claimed invention, nor do they teach the claimed invention in combination. Combining these references would produce an audit tracking system that tracked the ratio of plays to wins in a multi-balance setting, without disclosing how that is actually done. This is not Appellant's invention. Appellant's invention has significant features that are not disclosed by the combination of references such as anonymous accounts, the use of automated card dispensers to create anonymous accounts, and secure transfers.

Issue D (Group IV): Claims 11 & 13-15 are patentable over Jorasch and Kishishita and in view of LeStrange because none of these references alone or in combination yields Appellant's invention.

Claims 11 & 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorasch and Kishishita in view of LeStrange.

Claim 11

With respect to the combination of Jorasch and Kishishita in view of LeStrange in claim 11, the Examiner said that although Jorasch fails to teach maintaining records of transfers and calculated differences in a separate location from the player account, LeStrange stresses the importance of maintaining separate audit trails. *See* Office Action, page 9. In support, the Examiner cited LeStrange at column 2, lines 39-61. That section of LeStrange discusses the requirement that all gaming locations account separately for the different forms of monetary value that can be accepted. *Id.* at lines 39-43. The section fails to describe maintaining records of transfers and calculated differences in a separate location from the player account as the Examiner suggests. The Examiner focused on the term *audit trail* without ensuring that the applied reference actually discloses Appellant's invention.

Group 13

According to the Examiner, Jorasch likewise fails to disclose transferring a predetermined amount in claim 13. *See* Office Action, page 9. Again, the Examiner contended that LeStrange provides the missing disclosure. In support the Examiner cited LeStrange, column 8, lines 9-13. Specifically, LeStrange discloses "tickets or cards [that] can be issued by casinos for promotion events or as a means for limiting the amount of money that a player can gamble in states where the maximum amount is specified by law." *Id.* at lines 10-13. Thus, LeStrange describes limiting the amount a player can gamble, rather than transferring a predetermined amount as the Examiner suggested.

Claim 14

The Examiner also suggested that with respect to claim 14 that Jorasch discloses a transfer that is a function of the balance of the player account. *See* Office Action, page 10.

Assuming *arguendo* that Jorasch disclosed such a transfer, Jorasch does not disclose the transfer in association with a predetermined amount as Appellant claims. Therefore, the rejection is improper, the claims contain features not described in the prior art, and the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claim 15

In rejecting claim 15, the Examiner said Jorasch discloses classifying players based on their balances. *See* Office Action, page 10. In the cited portion, Jorasch discloses establishing a threshold to “discriminate between players that provide only enough payment for one play, or sufficient payment for more than one play.” Jorasch, column 6, lines 9-12. Rather than discriminating between players, Jorasch discloses discriminating between different levels of payment. Appellant however claims a method wherein the amount credited is a function of a classification of the player. This is the converse of Jorasch. Where players in Jorasch have to wager a certain threshold to obtain a classification, Appellant’s classification determines how much is credited.

The combination of these references would produce an audit trail stored only on the host computer for monitoring the separate monetary values of different forms of payment to comply with state laws on maximum gambling amounts. This is not Appellant’s invention.

Issue E (Group V): Claim 16 is patentable over Jorasch, Kishishita and LeStrange as applied to Walker because none of these references alone or in combination yields Appellant’s invention.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorasch, Kishishita and LeStrange in view of Walker, et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,227,972) (“Walker”). The number of references alone required to make the combination is suspect.

Claim 16

The Examiner acknowledged that Jorasch, Kishishita, and LeStrange fail to teach measuring the time between player account transactions and locking the account when the

measured time exceeds at least one established criterion. *See* Office Action, page 10. According to the Examiner, Walker teaches the use of expiring account balances to encourage players to revisit the casino in a particular timeframe. *See id.* Walker however makes clear that following the expiration period, remaining balances are automatically expired and do not roll over into any subsequent expiration periods. *See* Walker, Abstract. There is a difference between locking accounts and expiring credits and there is no suggestion that Appellant's account cannot be unlocked or is otherwise lost or decremented. Where expiring credits work to the casino's advantage to make players feel compelled to return to play within a certain time frame, locking an account can have benefits for both the casino and the player. Because Appellant's claim has additional and different features that are not described by the prior art and the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case for obviousness, the rejection is improper.

Issue F (Group VI): Claims 17-30, 32, 55-61 are patentable over Jorasch in view of LeStrange because neither of these references alone or in combination yields Appellant's invention.

Claims 17-30, 32, 55-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorasch in view of LeStrange.

Claim 17

With respect to claim 17, the Examiner stated that Jorasch does not disclose transferring a predetermined amount, but that LeStrange does. *See* Office Action, page 11. According to the Examiner, the motivation for doing so is to comply with state gambling laws. In support the Examiner again cited to LeStrange, column 8, lines 9-13. This particular selection describes the types of credit that can be played, such as promotional tickets or debit cards with specified dollar amounts. It specifies that these types of payment can be used by casinos to limit the amount of money a player can gamble in states where a maximum amount is specified by law. It falls short of disclosing "transferring a predetermined credit from the

account to the gaming device responsive to a transfer command *initiated by the player at said one gaming device.*” Moreover, there is no suggestion that Appellant’s *predetermined credit* is a maximum credit or is limited by law. In fact, Appellant’s claim suggests precisely the opposite. Rather than being a limitation on what the player can transfer or play, the *predetermined credit* is “responsive to a transfer command initiated by the player at said one gaming device.” The combination of references does not support the rejection as made by the Examiner. The claim contains features that are not described by the prior art and the Examiner has not made a prima facie case of obviousness as to the features that are described. As such, the rejection is improper.

Claim 57

Moreover, as to claims 57 and 58, the Examiner noted that neither Jorasch nor LeStrange “go into details” about the program needed to implement their disclosures. *See* Office Action, page 11. Rather than cite to a specific portion of the applied art that discloses the features of these claims, the Examiner, without support, stated that any program needing to comply with state laws that specify a maximum amount that could be used in gambling would require the use of flags associated with minimum and maximum amounts. *See id.* Yet, this argument is inconsistent with the Examiner’s asserted motivation of transferring a specific amount in order to comply with state laws. If the motivation is only to comply with state laws specifying maximum amounts, what would be the purpose of checking flags for minimum and maximum transfers—the only relevant flag would be whether the legal amount (i.e. maximum) had been reached. The Examiner’s combination of references fails to disclose the features of Appellant’s claim. To fill the gap, the Examiner has made an unsupported obviousness argument that is inconsistent with the claim. As a result, the rejection is improper.

Claim 58

Additionally, as to claim 58, if the motivation was only compliance with state laws on maximum amounts, there would be no need to impose minimum and maximum transfer limits when the account was opened because the amount would already be determined by law.

The Examiner's hindsight combination of the references is apparent in the statement:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have checked flags associated with the account for minimum and maximum transfer limits **in order to implement the disclosure of Jorasch and LeStrange into a workable system that complies with state laws.**

Office Action, page 12 [emphasis added]. It is only the Examiner who feels compelled to implement Jorasch and LeStrange into a workable system and to hypothesize how that system would work. The Examiner combination and asserted reason for making the combination are illogical in view of the claim and fail to disclose the features of the claim. As a result, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case for obviousness.

Claim 18

With respect to claim 18, the Examiner argued that Jorasch teaches local memory associated with the gaming device that receives player account information that is transmitted over a network from the central computer. *See* Office Action, page 12. Claim 18 is directed to permitting gaming device play and cashing out from the gaming device responsive to a second command initiated by said player at said one gaming device. Appellant therefore believes that the Examiner may have been referring to a different claim in making the objection, since the Examiner's statement of Jorasch does not address the subject matter of claim 18. Nevertheless, the Examiner has failed to identify any portions of the asserted art that would make the claim obvious.

Claim 19

The Examiner, with respect to claim 19, stated that Jorasch teaches transferring all of the credit from the gaming device to the account responsive to a transfer command initiated by the player at said one gaming device. *See* Office Action, page 12. Yet, the relevant section of Jorasch indicates that “an amount” rather than “all of the credit,” as claimed by Appellant in claim 19, is dispensed. Moreover, Jorasch further discloses that to be credited to an account, balances are “selected.” *See* Jorasch, column 10, lines 5-10. As a result, Jorasch fails to teach transferring all of the credit from the gaming device to the account responsive to a transfer command initiated by the player at the gaming device. Because the applied art does not support the Examiner’s rejection, the rejection is improper and the claim contains features that are not disclosed in the prior art.

Claim 20

As discussed above with respect to claim 17, Jorasch and Kishishita do not disclose or otherwise make obvious transferring predetermined credit from the account to the gaming device responsive to a transfer command initiated by the player at said one gaming device. As such, they do not disclose or make obvious the creation of a player account that enables such transfers. The Examiner’s combination discusses anonymous accounts, which are not claimed in the claim. As such, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness and the claim has features not described in the prior art.

Claim 21

As with claim 20, because Jorasch and Kishishita do not disclose or make obvious transferring predetermined credit from the account, discussed with respect to claim 17, they do not make obvious creating such an account at a terminal connected to the network by an agent of the casino. Therefore, the Examiner’s combination does not make a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claim 22

As discussed previously with respect to claim 4, there is no suggestion in Jorasch that it is inserting the card into the card reader that provides access to the account. Jorasch simply provides that a player can transfer funds to a gaming device from a card. Jorasch does not describe how it is that the player accesses the account. Because the claim has features that are not described in the prior art and the Examiner has not made a case for obviousness of the features, the rejection is improper.

Claim 23

As previously discussed with respect to claims 5 and 6, Jorasch discloses that dispensing typically includes activating a hopper to dispense money to the player and that some devices alternately credit an account **based on the selected balance(s)**. *See* Jorasch, column 10, lines 6-8. There is no suggestion in claim 23, or the claims from which it depends, that a player must select a balance prior to cashing out of a gaming device. Such a step would be illogical in a game with a single balance and would take more time for the player to perform. Because the applied art does not support the Examiner's characterization of it, the rejection is improper.

Claim 24

In rejecting claim 24, the Examiner said that Jorasch discloses local memory associated with the gaming device and that the local memory receives player account information transmitted over a network from the central computer. *See* Office Action, page 13. Instead Jorasch discloses a data storage device, containing the player database, connected via a processor and communication port to one or more gaming devices. *See* Jorasch, figures 2-3 and supporting text. In no way can this be construed as "transmitting data representing the player account over the network to a local memory associated with said gaming device,"

as Appellant claims. Because Jorasch fails to disclose local memory, there are errors in the rejection and the rejection is improper.

Claim 25

Because Jorasch does not disclose “transmitting data representing the player account over the network to a local memory associated with said gaming device,” as discussed with respect to claim 24, it necessarily cannot disclose transferring data from the player account in the local memory to the credit meter, as claimed by Appellant in claim 25. Again, there are errors in the rejection which render it improper.

Claim 26

In rejecting claim 26, the Examiner admitted that Jorasch and LeStrange fail to teach the details of accounting for balances transferred. *See* Office Action, page 13. Nevertheless, rather than identifying any source to support the obviousness rejection, the Examiner referred to the claim as “merely checking the accuracy of the final credit meter reading.” *See id.* The Examiner also stated that if the initial credit meter reading were \$0 and \$10 was transferred, a final credit meter reading of anything other than \$10 would indicate a problem. This simplistic analysis overlooks much.

The Examiner’s analogy fails to factor in the amount of the requested transfer, whether the actual transfer and the requested transfer were identical, and whether the pre and post transfer meter readings corresponded to the amount actually transferred, rather than the amount of the transfer request. Claim 26 recites calculating the difference in the meter readings and comparing the calculated difference with the amount transferred. Claim 26 does not recite comparing the calculated difference with the requested transfer amount as the Examiner’s analogy implies. The claim has features that are not disclosed in the applied art and the Examiner has provided an analogy that does not meet the scope of the claim. As a result, the rejection is improper.

Claim 27

As to claim 27 the Examiner again referred to standard accounting practice without providing any support for the rejection. *See* Office Action, page 14. According to the Examiner, if the calculated difference between the initial meter reading and the post-transfer reading were equal to the amount transferred, that amount would be deducted from the player's account balance. *See id.* Again, the Examiner failed to see the subtlety of the claim.

In claim 27 the method includes deducting the calculated difference from the account balance. It is not the requested amount that is deducted. It is not the pre and post meter readings that equal the amount transferred that are deducted, as the Examiner argues. *See* Office Action, page 14. Instead it is the calculated difference. Appellant submits that the standard accounting practice would be to deduct \$10 from the account balance if the player requested a \$10 transfer or made a \$10 wager. It is not standard accounting to receive a request, take a first meter reading, transfer credit, take a second meter reading, calculate the difference between the two meter readings, compare the calculated difference with the amount requested and deduct the calculated difference from the account balance. The Examiner's statement of obviousness is without support and the analogy meet the claims. As such, there are errors in the rejection.

Claim 28

Again with respect to claim 28 the Examiner acknowledged that Jorasch does not teach maintaining records of transfers and calculated differences in a separate location from the player account. *See* Office Action, page 14. Again the Examiner referred to this with the generic term *audit trail*. Again the Examiner cited LeStrange as stressing the importance of maintaining a separate *audit trail*. Yet, LeStrange fails altogether to disclose maintaining records of both transfers and calculated differences. LeStrange fails to disclose keeping those records in locations separate from the player account, as was discussed above with respect to

claim 45. LeStrange instead discloses providing separate accounting for different forms of machine payouts. *See* LeStrange, column 2, lines 51-53. The combination does not include all features of the claim and the Examiner's statement of what the combination does disclose is in error.

Claim 29

In rejecting claim 29, the Examiner stated that Jorasch discloses a transfer that is a function of the balance of the player account. *See* Office Action, page 14. However, Jorasch requires that a balance be selected. Appellant, in claim 29, recites a predetermined credit that is a function of the balance in the player account. Jorasch does not make Appellant's invention obvious, because Jorasch discloses a different type of system, one involving multiple balances. As such, the rejection is in error.

Claim 30

In support of the rejection of claim 30, the Examiner said that Jorasch discloses classifying players based on their balance. *See* Office Action, page 14. Appellant's claim is not limited to classifying players based on balance. Claim 30 recites the transfer of predetermined credit as a function of a classification of the player. Assuming *arguendo* that Jorasch disclosed transfers based on player classification, Jorasch still does not disclose the transfer in association with a predetermined amount and Jorasch requires that one of multiple balances be selected prior to transfer. With respect to claim 30, the combination does not disclose all of the claim's features and those features that are disclosed teach away from Appellant's invention.

Claim 32

As with several other rejections, in rejecting claim 32, rather than identifying a combination of references that make obvious Appellant's invention, the Examiner simply stated that the claim would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art without offering

support. Claim 32 claims a transfer command initiated by the player at the gaming device comprising actuating at least one of a plurality of actuators, each of which is associated with a predetermined credit amount. The Examiner postulated that because gaming devices have a minimum bet that it would have been obvious to associate each actuator on the keypad to correspond to a multiple of the minimum bet to avoid player confusion. *See Office Action*, page 15. Appellant, however, has not claimed actuators with predetermined amounts that are multiples of minimum bets. As such, the Examiner's stated reason is not related to Appellant's claim and the rejection is in error.

Claim 55

In rejecting claim 55 the Examiner stated, with no support, that if a computer makes a calculation, the computer must follow an algorithm which must be in local memory. *See Office Action*, page 15. First, the Examiner has not provided support for the rejection. Second, the applied art does not disclose the transfer of a predetermined amount, as set forth above. Third, the applied art does not disclose a predetermined credit that is calculated by an algorithm. As a result, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case for obviousness.

Claim 56

As to claim 56, which the Examiner discussed in conjunction with claim 55, the Examiner has failed to explain why an algorithm used by a computer to make a calculation would have to be in local memory. There is no suggestion in the applied art, which the Examiner has repeatedly argued operates on similar principles, that local memory is required for calculations. Therefore, it is overreaching to state that algorithms must be in local memory in order for computers to make calculations. The Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case for obviousness.

Claim 59

In rejecting claim 59, the Examiner stated that where the state sets a maximum amount that can be used for gambling, the predetermined credit is not a function of the account balance. *See* Office Action, page 15. When making the 112, first paragraph, rejection, argued with respect to claim 59 above, the Examiner stated the converse. *See* Office Action, page 3. There, the Examiner implied that the transfer of a credit will always be a function of a player's balance because if the player does not have sufficient funds available the transfer will not be made. The Examiner cannot have it both ways. Additionally, as discussed previously, the applied art does not disclose predetermined credit. Therefore, it necessarily does not disclose predetermined credit that is a function of the balance in the player account. The Examiner has once more failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness and the rejection that was made is replete with error.

Claim 60

In the rejection of claim 60, the Examiner asserted that while Jorasch and LeStrange do not go into details, they stress the importance of accounting, and that it would be obvious to prevent transfers in excess of the account balance. *See* Office Action, page 15. As a result, the Examiner has provided no support for this position. As previously discussed, features of Appellant's claims operate specifically as failsafe mechanisms.

Claim 61

The Examiner stated that with respect to claim 61 that LeStrange makes clear that the predetermined credit is not chosen by the player. *See* Office Action, page 16. However, because LeStrange fails to disclose predetermined credit, it cannot disclose such credit that is not selected by the player. As a result, the Examiner's rejection contains errors and, in addition, fails to make a prima facie case for obviousness.

When applying prior art references to make an obviousness rejection, an examiner cannot pick and choose the attributes of each reference he would like to combine and ignore the others. “A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety . . . including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention.” MPEP 2141.02 citing *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). Considering these references in their entirety, Appellant’s invention is not obvious.

With respect to the combination of Jorasch and LeStrange, Appellant submits that neither of these references teaches separately the claimed invention, nor do they teach the claimed invention in combination. Combining these references would produce a system that used promotional tickets or debit cards for one or more balances stored in a remote database to limit a player’s ability to gamble where maximum amounts are specified by law and an audit tracking system that updated meter values based on the player’s transfer request. This is not Appellant’s invention. The Examiner’s suggestion is not convincing and the references do not expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention.

Issue G (Group VII): Claim 31 is patentable over Jorasch and LeStrange as applied to Walker because none of these references alone or in combination yields Appellant’s invention.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorasch and LeStrange in view of Walker.

Claim 31

The Examiner acknowledged that Jorasch and LeStrange fail to teach measuring the time between player account transactions and locking the account when the measured time exceeds at least one established criterion. See Office Action, page 16. According to the Examiner, Walker teaches the use of expiring account balances to encourage players to revisit the casino in a particular timeframe. Walker, however, makes clear that following the

expiration period, remaining balances are automatically expired and do not roll over into any subsequent expiration periods. *See Walker, Abstract.* As previously argued, there is no suggestion that Appellant's account cannot be unlocked or that the account balance is forever lost. As a result, the applied art does not meet the scope of the claim and the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case for obviousness.

Issue H (Group VIII): Claims 34, 35 & 37 are patentable over LeStrange because LeStrange does not yield Appellant's invention.

Claims 34, 35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeStrange.

Claim 34

The Examiner, in rejecting claim 34, stated that although LeStrange does not discuss the subject matter of the claim, that the amount transferred to the gaming machine would be deducted from the player's account balance and the new balance would be stored on the system. *See Office Action, page 16.* The Examiner, without support, said that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have deducted the amount transferred to the gaming device from the player's account balance to comply with standard accounting practices. The Examiner did not say that reading the credit meter a first time, storing the first credit meter, transferring credit between the account and the gaming device, reading the credit meter a second time and storing the second meter reading is a standard accounting practice, and indeed it is not. Appellant, in claim 34, claims adjusting the account by the amount of credit transferred between the account and the gaming device and storing the account balance. The amount of credit transferred is based upon two readings of the credit meter. The Examiner's statement of obviousness does not include the features of Appellant's claim and as a result the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claim 35

The Examiner rejected claim 35 under the rationale that LeStrange teaches a separate database for stored meter readings. *See* Office Action, page 17. However, the cited selection fails to disclose this feature. As previously discussed with respect to claim 45, in LeStrange accounting data (including meter data) and customer data (player data) are stored in the same place, the host computer, in the same database. *See* LeStrange, column 7, lines 4-6. As such, LeStrange fails to teach a separate database for stored meter readings and there are errors in the rejection.

Claim 37

In rejecting claim 37 as unpatentable over LeStrange, the Examiner admitted that LeStrange does not specifically address the subject matter of the claim. *See* Office Action, page 17. Rather the Examiner stated, again without support, that it is a standard accounting practice to adjust the account by the amount of credit transferred between the account and the gaming device and storing the account balance after each transfer. In making the rejection, the Examiner again failed to consider the differences between the amount requested and the amount actually transferred and again there are errors in the rejection.

Issue I (Group IX): Claims 38, 39, 41, and 42 are patentable over LeStrange in view of Jorasch because neither of these references alone or in combination yields Appellant's invention.

Claims 38, 39, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeStrange in view of Jorasch.

Claim 38

Claims 38 and 39 depend from claim 33, which was rejected under different grounds. As previously discussed with respect to claim 33, the applied art fails to disclose providing access to the account responsive to a command initiated by a player at one of the gaming devices, reading the credit meter a first time, storing the first meter reading, transferring

credit between the account and the gaming device, reading the credit meter a second time, and storing the second meter reading. Therefore, because claim 38 further describes the creation of the player account, the applied art fails to disclose claim 38 and the rejection is improper.

Claim 39

Similarly, because claim 39 recites additional features, such as that creating the player account is performed at a terminal connected to the network by an agent of the casino, the applied art likewise fails to disclose claim 39 and the Examiner has not made a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claim 41

With respect to claims 41 and 42—Jorasch does not disclose local memory associated with a gaming device. *See* Office Action, page 18. The local memory (304) the Examiner referred to is located in a data storage device remote from the gaming machines. Appellant recites local memory associated with the gaming device. Local memory is supported in Figure 2 (50) and as such claim 41 is patentable over the applied art. Once more, there are errors in the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 42

Because the applied art fails to disclose transmitting data representing the player account over the network to a local memory associated with the gaming device, it necessary fails to disclose transferring the credit between the account in the local memory and the gaming device. Because of the errors in the rejection, as discussed with respect to claim 41, the Examiner has failed to make a case for obviousness.

Issue J (Group X): Claim 50 is patentable over LeStrange in view of Walker because neither of these references alone or in combination yields Appellant's invention.

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeStrange in view of Walker.

Claim 50

The Examiner acknowledged that LeStrange fails to teach measuring the time between player account transactions and locking the account when the measured time exceeds at least one established criterion. *See* Office Action, page 18. According to the Examiner, Walker teaches the use of expiring account balances to encourage players to revisit the casino in a particular timeframe. Walker however makes clear that following the expiration period, remaining balances are automatically expired and do not roll over into any subsequent expiration periods. *See* Walker, Abstract. There is no suggestion that Appellant's account cannot be unlocked or that the account is lost or diminished. Put differently, a locked account is different from expired credits. The Examiner's rejection contains errors because the Examiner has used a different feature from an unrelated application to make the rejection.

Issue K (Group XI): Claim 51 is patentable over Jorasch and Kishishita and further in view of Walker because none of these references alone or in combination yields Appellant's invention.

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorasch and Kishishita in view of Walker.

Claim 51

The Examiner acknowledged that Jorasch and Kishishita fail to teach measuring the time between player account transactions and locking the account when the measured time exceeds at least one established criterion. *See* Office Action, page 19. According to the Examiner, Walker teaches the use of expiring account balances to encourage players to revisit the casino in a particular timeframe. Walker however makes clear that following the expiration period, remaining balances are automatically expired and do not roll over into any subsequent expiration periods. *See* Walker, Abstract. There is no suggestion that Appellant's

account cannot be unlocked or that the account is lost or diminished. As previously argued, a locked account is different from expired credits. Again, the Examiner's rejection contains errors because the Examiner has used a different feature from an unrelated application to make the rejection.

Issue L (Group XII): Claims 52-54 are patentable over Jorasch and LeStrange and further in view of Kishishita because none of these references alone or in combination yields Appellant's invention.

Claims 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jorasch and LeStrange in view of Kishishita.

Claim 52

In rejecting claim 52, the Examiner cited Kishishita, column 3, lines 54-64, as supporting the position that Kishishita discloses an anonymous account in which the player pays in cash and receives a bar code identifying the account. *See* Office Action, page 19. Kishishita does not disclose creating an anonymous player account.

In Kishishita, the player goes to a game data processing unit which is generally provided at a reception desk. The game center accepts money and **“writes as data ID specific to the person** data which indicates a code number A and the number B of games which can be played with the amount of money paid. . .” [Emphasis added]. Kishishita, column 3, lines 58-61. By going to the reception desk and receiving identification specific to the player, including a code number for tracking the player, Kishishita's account is not anonymous. The casino knows who the player is and can track his activity. Rather Kishishita is a less sophisticated player account that uses paid-up credits. The combination of references do not support the Examiner's rejection and the claim contains features not disclosed in the applied art, for example anonymous player accounts.

Claims 53

The Examiner rejected claims 53 and 54 under the same rationale.⁵ The Examiner is incorrect in stating that Kishishita creates player accounts at an automated card dispenser. *See* Office Action, page 19. The Examiner identified Figure 2 (10) as supporting this argument. The specification supporting this figure says (10) is a game data processing unit generally provided at the reception desk. There is no suggestion that the process is automated and that people are not involved. The specification discloses the opposite. The game center (the reception desk) receives money and “writes” as data identification specific to the person. Kishishita, column 3, lines 58-60.

Claim 54

Again, the Examiner is incorrect in stating that Kishishita creates player accounts at an automated card dispenser. *See* Office Action, page 19. The Examiner identified Figure 2 (10) as supporting this argument. The specification supporting this figure says (10) is a game data processing unit generally provided at the reception desk. There is no suggestion that the process is automated and that people are not involved. The specification discloses the opposite. The game center (the reception desk) receives money and “writes” as data identification specific to the person. Kishishita, column 3, lines 58-60.

As with the other combinations made by the Examiner, the combination of Jorasch, LeStrange and Kishishita does not disclose or make obvious the claimed invention. Because Kishishita fails to disclose anonymous accounts, the combination does not work to make the Appellant’s claims obvious.

CONCLUSION

In rejecting the pending claims, the Examiner has failed to establish that the prior art anticipates the claims or renders them obvious. With regard to anticipation, the Examiner has

⁵ Additionally, although they depend from different independent claims, the two claims are identical and the reasons argued for patentability for one support the other, given that the Examiner has placed the two dependent

overlooked essential features of Appellant's invention that are not anticipated by the cited reference, including calculating the difference in two meter readings associated with the same request for credit transfer, comparing the calculated difference with the amount transferred, and storing the amount transferred and the calculated difference at a location on the network remote from the player account.

The Examiner, in making combinations for obviousness, in many cases admits the shortcomings of his combinations and to supplement them relies on his own hindsight understanding of what were common accounting practices in the art at the time of the application without providing any support for that understanding. As to each combination of references and each claim, the Examiner fails to establish a prima facie case for obviousness or demonstrate how the applied art renders the claims obvious.

For the foregoing reasons, Appellant requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejections to Appellant's claims.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C.



Hillary A. Brooks
Registration No. 45,815

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 S.W. Morrison Street
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 222-3613

claims in a grouping separate from their underlying independent claims, which are each in different groups.

APPENDIX
37 CFR §1.192(c) (9)

The text of the claims on appeal is:

Claims 1-35 and 37-61, as follows:

1. A method for operating gaming devices interconnected by a network to a host computer comprising:

creating an anonymous player account accessible by the host computer;
providing access to the account responsive to a first command initiated by a player at one of the gaming devices;
transferring credit from the account to the gaming device;
permitting gaming device play; and
cashing out from the gaming device responsive to a second command initiated by said player at said one gaming device.

2. The method of claim 1 wherein creating an anonymous player account accessible by the host computer comprises:

providing a tracking card to the player;
storing an anonymous player record on the host computer;
receiving an initial cash deposit from the player; and
crediting the deposit to the account.

3. The method of claim 2 wherein said gaming devices are in a casino and wherein creating a player account accessible by the host computer is performed at an automated card dispenser.

4. The method of claim 1 wherein said first command comprises insertion of a player tracking card into a card reader associated with said one gaming device.

5. The method of claim 4 wherein said second command comprises actuating a cash out actuator at said one gaming device.

6. The method of claim 1 wherein said second command comprises actuating a cash-out actuator at said one gaming device.

7. The method of claim 1 wherein providing access to the account comprises transmitting data representing the player account over the network to a local memory associated with said one gaming device.

8. The method of claim 7 wherein transferring from the account to the gaming device comprises transferring data from the player account in the local memory to the credit meter.

9. A method for secure cashless transfer of credit between a player account communicating with a networked gaming device comprising:

- receiving a request to transfer credit;
- reading the credit meter on said one gaming device before transferring credit;
- crediting the meter with the requested credit transfer;
- reading the credit meter on said one gaming device after crediting the meter;
- calculating the difference in the meter readings;
- comparing the calculated difference with the amount credited; and
- permitting gaming device play.

10. The method of claim 9 wherein said method further includes deducting the calculated difference from the account balance.

11. The method of claim 10 wherein said method further comprises storing the amount credited and the calculated difference at a location on the network remote from the player account.

12. The method of claim 11 wherein a request to transfer credit from the account to the gaming device occurs responsive to a player-initiated command at said one gaming device.

13. The method of claim 12 wherein the amount credited is predetermined.

14. The method of claim 13 wherein the amount credited is a function of the balance in the player account.

15. The method of claim 13 wherein the amount credited is a function of a classification of the player.

16. The method of claim 13 wherein said method further comprises:
measuring the time between each player account transaction; and
locking the account when the measured time exceeds at least one established criterion.

17. A method for operating gaming devices interconnected by a network to a host computer comprising:

creating a player account accessible by the host computer;
providing access to the account responsive to a first command initiated by a player at one of the gaming devices; and
transferring a predetermined credit from the account to the gaming device responsive to a transfer command initiated by the player at said one gaming device.

18. The method of claim 17 wherein said method further includes;
permitting gaming device play; and
cashing out from the gaming device responsive to a second command initiated by said player at said one gaming device.

19. The method of claim 17 wherein said method further includes;
permitting gaming device play; and
transferring all of the credit from the gaming device to the account responsive to a transfer command initiated by the player at said one gaming device.

20. The method of claim 17 wherein creating a player account accessible by the host computer comprises:

issuing a tracking card to the player;
storing a player record on the host computer;
receiving an initial cash deposit from the player; and
crediting the deposit to the account.

21. The method of claim 20 wherein said gaming devices are in a casino and wherein creating a player account accessible by the host computer is performed at a terminal connected to the network by an agent of the casino.

22. The method of claim 17 wherein said first command comprises insertion of a player tracking card into a card reader associated with said one gaming device.

23. The method of claim 18 wherein said second command comprises actuating a cash-out actuator at said one gaming device.

24. The method of claim 17 wherein providing access to the account comprises transmitting data representing the player account over the network to a local memory associated with said one gaming device.

25. The method of claim 24 wherein transferring a predetermined credit from the account to the gaming device comprises transferring data from the player account in the local memory to the credit meter.

26. The method of claim 17 wherein said method further comprises:
reading the a credit meter on said one gaming device before transferring said predetermined credit;
reading the credit meter on said one gaming device after transferring said predetermined credit;
calculating the a difference in the meter readings; and
comparing the calculated difference with the amount transferred.

27. The method of claim 26 wherein said method further includes deducting the calculated difference from the account balance.

28. The method of claim 27 wherein said method further comprises storing the amount transferred and the calculated difference at a location on the network remote from the player account.

29. The method of claim 17 wherein the amount of said predetermined credit is a function of the balance in the player account.

30. The method of claim 17 wherein the amount of said predetermined credit transferred is a function of a classification of the player.

31. The method of claim 17 wherein said method further comprises:
measuring the time between each player account transaction; and
locking the account when the measured time exceeds at least one established criterion.

32. The method of claim 17 wherein the transfer command initiated by the player at said one gaming device comprises actuating at least one of a plurality of actuators, each of which is associated with a predetermined credit amount.

33. A method for operating gaming devices interconnected by a network to a host computer comprising:

creating a player account accessible by the host computer;
providing access to the account responsive to a command initiated by a player at one of the gaming devices;
reading the credit meter a first time;
storing the first meter reading;
transferring credit between the account and the gaming device;
reading the credit meter a second time; and
storing the second meter reading.

34. The method of claim 33 wherein said method further includes:
adjusting the account by the amount of credit transferred between the account and the gaming device; and
storing the account balance.

35. The method of claim 34 wherein the stored meter readings are at a different location from the stored account balance.

37. The method of claim 36 wherein said method further includes:

adjusting the account by the amount of credit transferred between the account and the gaming device; and
storing the account balance after each transfer.

38. The method of claim 33 wherein creating a player account accessible by the host computer comprises:

issuing a tracking card to the player;
storing a player record on the host computer;
receiving an initial cash deposit from the player; and
crediting the deposit to the account.

39. The method of claim 38 wherein said gaming devices are in a casino and wherein creating a player account accessible by the host computer is performed at a terminal connected to the network by an agent of the casino.

40. The method of claim 33 wherein said command comprises insertion of a player tracking card into a card reader associated with said one gaming device.

41. The method of claim 33 wherein providing access to the account comprises transmitting data representing the player account over the network to a local memory associated with said one gaming device.

42. The method of claim 33 wherein transferring the credit between the account and the gaming device comprises transferring data between the account in the local memory and the gaming device.

43. The method of claim 33 wherein said method further comprises:
reading the credit meter on said one gaming device before transferring credit;
reading the credit meter on said one gaming device after transferring credit;
calculating the difference in the meter readings; and
comparing the calculated difference with the amount transferred.

44. The method of claim 43 wherein method further includes deducting the calculated difference from the account balance.

45. The method of claim 44 wherein said method further comprises storing the amount transferred and the calculated difference at a location on the network remote from the player account.

46. The method of claim 33 wherein transferring credit between the account and the gaming device occurs responsive to a player-initiated command at said one gaming device.

47. The method of claim 46 wherein the amount transferred is predetermined.

48. The method of claim 47 wherein the amount transferred is a function of the balance in the player account.

49. The method of claim 47 wherein the amount transferred is a function of a classification of the player.

50. The method of claim 33 wherein said method further comprises:
measuring the time between each player account transaction; and
locking the account when the measured time exceeds at least one established criterion.

51. The method of claim 9 wherein said method further comprises;
measuring the time between each player account transaction; and
locking the account when the measured time exceeds at least one established criterion.

52. The method of claim 17 wherein the player account is an anonymous account.

53. The method of claim 20 wherein said gaming devices are in a casino and wherein creating a player account accessible by the host computer is performed at an automated card dispenser.

54. The method of claim 38 wherein said gaming devices are in a casino and wherein creating a player account accessible by the host computer is performed at an automated card dispenser.

55. The method of claim 17 wherein the predetermined credit is calculated by an algorithm.

56. The method of claim 55 wherein the algorithm is stored in local memory.

57. The method of claim 56 wherein the algorithm checks flags associated with the account for minimum and maximum transfer limits.

58. The method of claim 57 wherein the minimum and maximum transfer limits are imposed when the account is opened.

59. The method of claim 17 wherein the amount of said predetermined credit is not a function of the balance in the player account.

60. The method of claim 55 wherein the algorithm examines the account balance prior to transferring the predetermined credit to prevent transfers in excess of the account balance.

61. The method of claim 17 wherein the amount of said predetermined credit is not selected by the player.